

REMARKS

I. Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

In the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected Claims 1, 7, 10, 11 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention. Applicants have amended the above Claims to more clearly describe the invention. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner's rejection of Claims 1, 7, 10, 11 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph, has been effectively traversed. Such action is earnestly solicited.

II. Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

In the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected Claims 1-3, 5 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being unpatentable over Rai et al, U.S. Patent 6,675,208.

Applicants respectfully disagree. However, Applicants have amended Claim 1 to further patentably distinguish Applicants' claimed invention from the cited prior art. Claim 1 now reads:

A satellite network system having STAR topology comprising:
a hub site; and
a plurality of remote sites, each remote site having a remote site modem to allow directly communication with another remote site;
wherein call control and management between the hub site and the remote site use Internet Protocol (IP) addressing and HDLC addressing at a link level for identification thereby allowing only a desired remote site to read data transmitted;

wherein direct single-hop connectivity is achieved between remote sites through the use of IP addressing.

Claim 12 now reads:

A network system having STAR topology and which allows on demand single hop connectivity between remote sites comprising:

- a hub site;
- a plurality of remote sites;
- a first channel for sending data from the hub site to all of the plurality of remote sites;
- a plurality of second channels for transmitting data from each of the plurality of remote sites to the hub site and for transmitting data between the plurality of remote sites;

wherein call control and management between the hub site and the remote sites and between different remote sites use Internet Protocol (IP) addressing for identification;

wherein the hub site comprises:

- a first IP modem for receiving and transmitting data to and from the hub site and for maintaining a network database;

- at least a second IP modem for receiving data from a remote site; and

- a single hop server for configuring channels to transmit data directly between different remote sites;

wherein each of the plurality of remote sites comprises:

- a first remote modem for continuously receiving data from the hub site and for transmitting data when required; and

- a second remote modem for receiving data sent from a different remote site.

In contrast Rai fails to disclose or anticipate Applicants invention as now claimed. Rai fails to disclose or anticipate each remote site having a remote site modem to allow directly communication with another remote site. Rai also fails to disclose direct single-hop connectivity achieved between remote sites through the use of IP addressing. To further differentiate

Applicant's claimed invention, Applicants use a single hop server for configuring channels to transmit data directly between different remote sites.

The Examiner claims that Rai discloses a remote modem for each remote site in Figure 2 item 36. Applicants respectfully disagree. Nowhere is it disclosed or anticipated that the base station 36 can directly communicate with another base station 36. In fact, as shown in Figure 2, all communications go through the backhaul network 38. Figure 2 shows no direct lines of communication between the base stations 36. Furthermore, Rai also fails to disclose or anticipate a single hop server for configuring channels to transmit data directly between different remote sites.

For the above reasons, Applicants believe the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), have been overcome. Such action is earnestly solicited.

III. Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected Claims 4, 6-10, 13-15 and 17-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Rai et al, U.S. Patent 6,675,208 in view of Krishnamurthy et al., U.S. Patent 6,389,464. The Examiner has also rejected Claims 16, 19-20 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Rai et al, U.S. Patent 6,675,208 in view of Krishnamurthy et al., U.S. Patent 6,389,464 and further in view of Gerszberg et al., U.S. Patent 6,480,748.

Applicants respectfully disagree. As already stated above, Rai fails to disclose or anticipate that the base station 36 can directly communicate with another base station 36. In fact, as shown in Figure 2, all communications go through the backhaul network 38. Figure 2 shows no direct lines of communication between the base stations 36. Furthermore, Rai also fails to disclose or anticipate a single hop server for configuring channels to transmit data directly between different remote sites.

Krishnamurthy et al. also fails to disclose or anticipate each remote site having a remote site modem to allow directly communication with another remote site, direct single-hop connectivity achieved between remote sites through the use of IP addressing, and a single hop server for configuring channels to transmit data directly between different remote sites.

With regards to Claims 16, 19-20 and 22, none of the cited references disclose a single hop server at the hub site or direct channel communication between remote sites.

For the above reasons, Applicants believe the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), have been overcome. Such action is earnestly solicited.

IV. Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that this Amendment Letter, including the amendments to the Claims, and in view of the Remarks offered in conjunction therewith, are fully responsive to all aspects of the objections and rejections tendered by the

Examiner. Applicants respectfully submit that they have persuasively demonstrated that the above-identified Patent Application, including Claims 1, 3-8, 10-12-13, and 15-22 are in condition for allowance. Such action is earnestly solicited.

If the foregoing does not place the case in condition for immediate allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned for purposes of a telephone interview.

If there are any fees incurred by this Amendment Letter, please deduct them from our Deposit Account NO. 23-0830.

Respectfully submitted,



Jeffrey D. Moy
Reg. No. 39,307
Attorney for Applicants

Weiss, Moy & Harris, P.C.
4204 N. Brown Ave.
Scottsdale, AZ 85251
(480) 994-8888 (Phone)
(480) 947-2663 (Fax)

JDM/wp